

**WILLIAMSBURG
ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES
Tuesday, July 13, 2004**

CALL TO ORDER AND ATTENDANCE

The regular semimonthly Architectural Review Board meeting was held on Tuesday, July 13, 2004, at 6:30 p.m. in the third Floor Conference Room of the Municipal Building.

Chairman Williams called the meeting to order. Present in addition to Mr. Williams were Board members Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Pons, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Walker Mr. Spence and Mr. Watson. Also present was Zoning Administrator Murphy and Zoning Officer Beck.

CONSENT AGENDA

ARB #04-076 Hertzler/605 College Terrace – Fence – Approved.

ARB #04-079 Revilock/206 Brooks Street – Pergola – Approved.

**ARB #04-075 Wyndham Plantation Homeowners Association/Zelkova Road
– Fence – Approved.**

ARB

**SIGN #04-034 Rehab Care Physical Therapy/120 Monticello Avenue, Suite
200 – Building Mounted Signs – Approved.**

ARB

**SIGN #04-035 Med Express Urgent Care/120 Monticello Avenue, Suite 100 –
Monument & Building Mounted Signs – Approved.**

ARB

**SIGN #04-036 CW Ticket Sales Office/101 South Henry Street – Awning &
Awning Signage – Approved.**

ARB

**SIGN #04-037 Hilton Garden Inn/1628 Richmond Road – Monument &
Building Mounted Signage – Approved.**

ARB

**SIGN #04-038 All of You Salon & Day Spa/511 York Street – Monument Sign
– Approved.**

ARB #04-074 Oebbecke/104 Cove Point Lane – Screen Porch – Approved.

Mr. Williams motioned to approve the consent agenda as presented

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Walker, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pons, Mr.
Spence, Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Spence ARB Sign #04-036.

ARCHITECTURAL PRESERVATION DISTRICT

ARB #04-073 Cundari/Montessori School/420 Scotland Street – Exterior Change (cladding of brick molds and sills for windows)

Ed Pease, Architect presented the request for cladding of the brick molds and sills for the windows on the school. He noted the removal of lead paint from the windows would be expensive and could damage the existing double-hung windows with cladding the windows being a better alternative. Mr. Spence and Mr. Sandbeck noted the mock-up window looked good from a distance, but up close the detail to the miter joints, saw cuts, sashes were rough, and the gaps were not caulked and sealed. Mr. Pease stated the mock-up was a rough mock-up and not the finished product and noted for completion the gaps would be caulked and sealed. Several Board members asked which windows would not be cladded. Mr. Pease stated the projecting bay window, dining room windows, front door and sidelights and the back porch windows.

Mr. Sandbeck motioned to approve ARB #04-073 conditioned upon the following:

- Only the double hung windows being approved for cladding.
- The sashes, miter joints, saw cuts and gaps being caulked and sealed.
- That staff approved the first finished window before additional windows are cladded to ensure the miter joints do not have any vertical or horizontal gaps as the current mock-up.

Chairman Williams noted the request was approved in this case because of the hazard of lead base paint and the use of the structure which is a school.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Walker, Williams, Mr. Pons, Mr. Spence, Mr. Watson.
Nay: None.
Absent: None.
Abstain: None.

ARB #04-077 Jackson/604 South Henry Street – Demolition Single-Family Dwelling

Susanna Hickman, Geddy, Harris, Franck, & Hickman, L.L.P., John Digges, Developer, and Gracie Jackson, owner, were present to discuss the case for the demolition of the single-family dwelling at 604 South Henry Street.

Mr. Diggs noted the following reasons for demolition:

- The house is not worth salvaging because of the significant cost to repair the structure and it does not have any historic value.
- The redevelopment potential of the area if several lots can be combined.
- In a discussion with Reed Nester, Planning Director, this area is marked for redevelopment in the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Hickman stated the dwelling was constructed around 1937 and noted the following reasons for demolition:

- It has no historical significance.
- The cost to repair the structure is too great.
- Presented an additional picture indicating bats were living in the dwelling.

Ms. Jackson noted she wanted to demolish the house because she lived elsewhere, did not have the money to maintain it and was recently cited by the City to repaint the exterior of the house because of peeling paint.

A lengthy discussion followed concerning demolition or salvaging of the dwelling.

Mr. Sandbeck expressed the following concerns with the proposed demolition:

- The dwelling represents an architecture found in historical working class neighborhoods during the 1940's.
- This type of working class architecture is diminishing in the City.
- An evaluation of the existing conditions and costs should be presented for review.
- A rich person's residence is not the only house that has historic value.

Mr. Walker concurred with Mr. Sandbeck adding that this house appeared to be salvageable and as Mr. Diggs noted it is the only one left of its type in the City.

Mr. Spence concurred with Mr. Sandbeck and Mr. Walker noting that unlike the other houses this appeared to be salvageable.

Mr. Pons asked the following:

- If the house had been put on the open market? Ms. Jackson stated, no.
- If there was a regulation for putting the house on the open market before it is approved for demolish? Carolyn Murphy noted Section 21-858 which allows the applicant to petition City Council for demolition of a structure if had been on the open market unsuccessfully for 12 months at a reasonable price related to its fair market value.
- If the interior of the house had been inspected? Mr. Diggs stated he never been inside the house and that an inspection relating to its condition had

not been performed. Photographs were provided indicating general deterioration of the ceilings, walls, and other areas.

- If development plans had been prepared designed for the property. Mr. Diggs stated no but presented a prototype condominium development plan that he got from a developer in Northern Virginia. Mr. Digges noted that vinyl siding, vinyl windows and vinyl trim would comprise a typical exterior upgrade for a property of this nature before offering it as a rental.

Mr. Pons noted he would not be in favor of the demolition because the house had not been on the open market and that the applicant had not presented any concrete plans for redevelopment.

Mr. Williams counter that the Board should let the applicant demolish the house because it is in disrepair and her choice. Since the house was in poor condition, was not a house of historical value, and the City had designated the area on which it stand as a site for redevelopment, this application should be approved.

Mr. Durbin concurred with Mr. Williams adding that her house was cited for peeling exterior paint and not approving the demolition would create an economic hardship for her because she would have to paint the house.

Mr. Watson concurred with Mr. Williams and Mr. Durbin. He asked Ms Jackson if she wanted to have the house demolished. She stated, yes. He stated that they would be delaying the process of the demolition occurring causing a hardship on Ms. Jackson who willingly wants to have the house demolished.

Andy Edward and Bob Lyons 800 South Henry Street spoke in favor of preserving the house. They stated that they lived in one of the historically no value homes referred to by Mr. Diggs and they hated to see the similar homes disappear from this general neighborhood. They noted that part of the duty of the Architecture Review Board was to preserve the older homes. In thirty years this home would be a hundred years old.

Mr. Sandbeck noted the applicant did not present a case for demolition due to its condition nor was any consideration given to relocating the dwelling, i.e., no preservation solution was offered by the applicant.

Mr. Walker motioned to deny ARB #04-077 noting the following:

1. The applicant did not offer sufficient evidence to prove that the building is beyond repair.
2. No consideration was given to relocating the dwelling.
3. The corner location of the building allows for the potential redevelopment of the site while keeping the existing dwelling as a representation of the type of dwelling workers inhabited earlier in the history of the City.

4. The applicant proposes demolition of a structure that is on the City's Listing of Locally Significant Architecture and Areas without showing the type of redevelopment planned for the property.
5. The owner of the building has the option to utilize Sec. 21-858 of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows the owner to demolish the building if the owner has applied to City Council for such right, and if the building has been offered for sale for a 12 month period and no one purchases the property for restoration.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Walker, Mr. Pons, Mr. Spence.

Nay: Mr. Durbin, Mr. Williams, Mr. Watson.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

ARB #04-078 Yankee Candle/2200 Richmond Road – New Retail Building

Veron Geddy, III, Attorney, Brady Harding, Design Forum Architects, Al Whitman, Yankee Candle Company, and Bob Singley, RJS and Associates presented their plans for 45,000 square foot retail Yankee Candle building with 20,000 square feet of storage.

Mr. Harding stated that would be the second flagship store for Yankee Candle store and noted the following architectural features and materials of the building:

- A mansard roof with architectural grade shingles all away around the building to hide all the mechanical equipment on the roof.
- The building is 75% brick with Hardiplank siding to break up the mass of the building.
- Colors chosen were from the approved Williamsburg color chart.
- The crown moulds would be a phicon material.

The Board noted the following concerns:

- The features in the back and sides elevations not reflecting the features in the front as stated in the **Design Review Guidelines**, and noted the Hilton Gardens and Residence Inn as examples that have met the guidelines.
- Building over 10,000 square feet should be brick as stated in the **Design Review Guidelines**.
- The amount of brick along rear should be broken up.

Mr. Harding stated since the building is massive that the Hardiplank siding was proposed on the wings and sides to help soften the appearance of the building.

Bob Singley stated he talked to the property owners behind the proposed site and their main concern was teenagers cutting through their back yards going to the Snow-To-Go on Richmond Road. He said the neighbors wanted a six-foot fence along the rear of the Yankee Candle property to address this concern with intense landscaping.

The Board suggested adding windows to the sides and rear elevations of the wings to break up of the mass of Hardiplank siding and brick. They also suggested the applicant investigate the use of different brick colors to break up the mass and suggested they visit Holiday Inn Express on Richmond Road for an example. The applicant agreed to investigate these suggestions.

Mr. Williams motioned to conceptually approve ARB #04-078 with the following conditions:

- Adding more detail to the side of the building as discussed at the meeting.
- Investigate breaking up the mass of brick on the rear.

Recorded vote on the motion:

Aye: Mr. Sandbeck, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Walker, Mr. Williams, Mr. Pons, Mr. Spence, Mr. Watson.

Nay: None.

Absent: None.

Abstain: None.

Minutes June 22, 2004

The minutes were approved as presented.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

Jason Beck
Zoning Officer